

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

SOLIDSTRIP, INC.,	:	
	:	Case No. 5:21CV00731
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Judge John R. Adams
	:	
U.S. TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, et al.,	:	
	:	<u>ORDER</u>
Defendants.	:	(Resolving Doc. 115, 117).

This matter is before the Court on Defendants’ U.S. Technology Corporation (“U.S. Technology”) and Raymond Williams (“Williams”) Motion to Clarify the current status of this case on November 30, 2021, (Doc. 115) and on Plaintiff Solidstrip, Inc.’s (“Solidstrip”) Motion for Protective Order and Other Relief filed on December 20, 2021 (Doc. 117).

Defendant U.S. Technology Media Corporation (“Media”) filed a Motion for Leave to file a cross-claim on November 5, 2021. (Doc. 112). On November 30, 2021, U.S. Technology and Williams filed their Motion for Clarification, questioning whether this Court has jurisdiction to consider Media’s Motion for Leave to file a cross-claim. (Doc. 115). U.S. Technology and Williams claimed confusion because they had previously appealed the Court’s Order of Attachment to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. (Doc. 103). This Court has jurisdiction over all matters not before the Sixth Circuit, which it so exercised, for example, by rejecting the parties’ proposed joint protective order. (Doc. 116). Therefore, the Court has jurisdiction to consider Media’s motion for leave to file a cross claim. (Doc. 112).

Upon clarification, U.S. Technology moves for a 21-day extension to respond to Media’s Motion for Leave to file a cross-claim. The Court GRANTS in part and DENIES this request in part. U.S. Technology and Williams waited until well after the due date for their response to

Media's Motion for Leave to seek clarification. Further, U.S. Technology and Williams seek a 21-day extension to respond to a non-dispositive motion. The Court will not grant such a lengthy extension. U.S. Technology and Williams shall have **ten (10) days from the date** of this Order to file their response to Media's Motion for Leave.

Further, it appears that U.S. Technology and Williams' mistaken understanding of the Court's jurisdiction has led to issues with discovery and the protective order. On December 20, 2021, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Protective Order and Other Relief alleging that U.S. Technology and Williams indicated they would not proceed with discovery nor review the protective order because the matter was on appeal. (Doc. 117, p. 2). As explained, the Court maintains jurisdiction over this matter and discovery shall proceed. Because Plaintiff's motion indicates that the proposed protective order was not approved by any of the Defendants, it is **DENIED** at this time. To the extent that a protective order is necessary to proceed, the parties shall confer regarding a compliant joint protective order.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, Defendants U.S. Technology and Williams' Motion for Clarification (Doc. 115) is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part. (Doc. 115). Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order and Other Relief is **DENIED**. (Doc. 117). U.S. Technology and Williams shall have ten (10) days from the date of this Order to respond to Media's Motion for Leave. The parties shall confer regarding the filing of a complaint Protective Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 3, 2022

s/Judge John R. Adams
John R. Adams
United States District Judge